

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

Vol. I, No. 26

Saturday, April 12, 1919

Price 3 Cents

"Democracy" and Dictatorship in Germany

By N. Lenin

(January 5, 1919)

THE few issues of the Berlin *Red Flag* [the Spartacan-Liebkecht organ] and the Vienna *Claron*, the organ of the Communist Party of German Austria, that have reached Moscow show that the betrayers of Socialism who during the war supported the governments of the imperialistic brigands, all the Scheidemanns, Eberts, Austerlitzes and Renners, have been denounced by the true representatives of the revolutionary proletariat of Germany and Austria. We cordially greet these two organs of revolutionary Socialism, testifying to the vitality and the growth of the Third International.

Apparently the main issue of the revolution both in Germany and Austria is now this: a Constituent Assembly *versus* all power to the Soviets. The representatives of the bankrupt Second International—all of them, beginning with the "majority Socialist" Scheidemann and ending with the "Independent Socialist" Karl Kautsky—are favoring the Constituent Assembly, calling their attitude a defense of "democracy." I shall try, briefly, to state the substance of the controversy which has now become a practical issue for all advanced capitalist countries.

The Scheidemanns and Kautskys are speaking about "pure democracy," or "democracy" in the abstract, in order to deceive the masses and conceal from them the *bourgeois* character of modern democracy. Let the bourgeoisie continue to hold in its hands the whole apparatus of the state: let a handful of exploiters continue to control the existing bourgeois state machinery—of what avail is "democracy?" The bourgeoisie, naturally, likes to describe the elections conducted under such conditions as "free," "equal," "democratic" and "popular." But these words serve to conceal the truth that the ownership of the means of production and the political power remain in the hands of the exploiters, and that genuine freedom and equality for the exploited, that is, for the overwhelming majority of the people, are therefore impossible. It pays the bourgeoisie to conceal from the people the *bourgeois* character of modern democracy, and it is forced to speak of democracy in the abstract, or "pure democracy." And the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, repeating these bourgeois arguments, actually renounce the proletarian standpoint and desert to the bourgeoisie.

When Marx and Engels signed the last preface to the *Communist Manifesto* (in 1872) they deemed it necessary to impress upon the workers particularly and emphatically that the proletariat cannot simply seize the existing (that is, bourgeois) state machinery and employ it for its own ends; that the proletariat must break this machinery. The renegade Kautsky has written a whole brochure on *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, but failed to mention this important Marxian truth, and fundamentally distorted Marxism. The Scheidemanns, naturally, generously praised this brochure—praise which was well deserved, for one who deserts to the bourgeoisie ought to be praised by the agents of the bourgeoisie.

Now, when the workers and all toilers are starving, when they are in rags, ruined and worn out not only by capitalistic wage slavery but also by four years of the imperialistic war, while the capitalists and speculators continue to own the "property" they have plundered and the existing state apparatus—now, in particular, it is sheer mockery of the exploited to speak of democracy as an abstract idea, of equality, freedom and popular rule in general. It means a complete repudiation of the fundamental Marxian truth which taught the workers: you must utilize bourgeois democracy as a real step forward in history in comparison with feudalism, but do not for a single moment forget the bourgeois character of this "democracy," its historical basis and limitations; do not share the "superstitions faith" in the "state," do not forget that the state, not only in a monarchy but in the most democratic republic, is nothing else than a machine for the suppression of one class by another.

The bourgeoisie is forced to play the hypocrite, to speak of a democratic (bourgeois) republic as the "role of the people," of an abstract or "pure" democracy, whereas this democratic republic is in reality the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie—the dictatorship

of the exploiters over the toiling masses. The Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners (and now, unfortunately, with the aid of Friedrich Adler) support these lies and hypocrisy. The Marxists, the Communists, on the contrary, expose this and tell the workers the plain truth: in reality a democratic republic, Constituent Assembly and popular elections, etc., are nothing but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and there is but one road to the emancipation of labor from the tyranny of capital—to replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only the dictatorship of

Greetings to the Soviet Republic of Bavaria!

A proletarian dictatorship has been proclaimed in Bavaria, and a Soviet Republic organized with a Council of People's Commissaires. The Central Council of Bavaria sent the following telegram to all the Soviets:

The workers of Bavaria have overcome their party divisions and united in a mighty bloc against all domination and exploitation. They have taken over through the Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Councils the entire public authority. The dictatorship of the proletariat is now a fact.

The Landtag has been dissolved and People's Commissaires have been appointed. Workshops will be controlled by factory councils elected by the workers, which will control and direct affairs jointly with the managers. Everything belongs to the community. Independent socialization, therefore, is out of the question. It is the duty of the Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Councils everywhere to attend to the protection of the Soviet Republic and its peaceful development. They will take over local authority and control of the administration and are responsible to the working people.

As a protection for the Bavarian Council of the Republic against counter-revolutionary attacks from without and within a Red army will be created immediately and a revolutionary court will pursue ruthlessly every attempt upon the Council.

The government of the Bavarian Soviet Republic follows the example of the Hungarian and Russian peoples. It will resume immediately a brotherly connection with these peoples, but it declines any connection with the contemptible Ebert-Scheidemann government, because that government is continuing, under the flag of a Socialistic republic, the imperialistic, capitalistic and military business of the disgraced broken-down German empire. It calls upon all German workers to take the same view. It greets all proletarians wherever revolutionary Socialism is fighting—in Wurttemberg, in the Ruhr district, in the whole world.

Long live free Bavaria! Long live the Soviet Government! Long live the world revolution!

the proletariat is capable of liberating humanity from the oppression of capital, from the lies and hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy—which is a democracy for the rich. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat can establish a democracy for the poor, and make the blessings of democracy actually accessible to the workers and poorer peasants; at present (even in the most democratic bourgeois republic) these blessings are practically inaccessible to the majority of the toilers.

Let us take, for example, the freedom of assembly and the freedom of the press. The Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners, assure the workers that the present elections to the Constituent Assembly of Germany and Austria are "democratic." This is a lie. For, in reality, the exploiters—capitalists, landlords and speculators—control—the capitalists of the best buildings which are fit for nine-tenths of the paper supply, printing meetings, and nine-tenths of the paper supply, printing meetings, etc. The workers in the city and the farm laborers in the villages are in reality denied these democratic rights by means of the "sacred right of democratic rights" which is protected by the Kautskys and Renners, as well as by the bourgeois state apparatus, that is, by bourgeois government officials, bourgeois judges and police, etc. The present "freedom of assembly and press" in a "democratic" (bour-

geois-democratic German republic) is a lie and a fraud. For, in reality, it means freedom for the rich to buy and to bribe the press, to corrupt the minds of the people with the lies of the bourgeois press. It means freedom for the rich to "own" manor-houses, the best buildings, etc. The dictatorship of the proletariat will take away from the capitalists, for the benefit of the toilers, the manor-houses, the best buildings, the printing shops and the stores of paper.

But—about the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners, as well as the Gomperses, Hendersons, Renaudels, Vanderveldes, etc.—this means that "popular," "pure" democracy will be replaced by the "dictatorship of one class."

Our reply is: it is not true. It means that what is actually a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (hypocritically veiled by the forms of a bourgeois democratic republic) will be replaced by a dictatorship of the proletariat. A democracy for the poor will replace a democracy for the rich. Freedom of assembly and the press for the minority, the exploiters, will be replaced by freedom of assembly and the press for the majority of the people, the toilers. This will mean a colossal extension of democracy, of universal historical significance, its transformation from a lie into truth, the liberation of humanity from the fetters of capital, which distort and crush even the most "democratic" bourgeois republican democracy. It will mean that the bourgeois state will be replaced by a proletarian state, and this change is the only way to the gradual disappearance of the state.

But why is it not possible to achieve this and to limit the dictatorship of one class? Why can't we directly and immediately obtain "pure" democracy? Ask the hypocritical friends of the bourgeoisie or the naive petty bourgeois and philistines deceived by the bourgeoisie.

Our reply is: because in every capitalist society the decisive factor is either the bourgeoisie or the proletariat, while the small capitalists inevitably remain hesitating and impotent, foolish dreamers of "pure," non-class or super-class, democracy. Because a society wherein one class oppresses another class cannot be abolished otherwise than by the dictatorship of the oppressed class. Because only the proletariat can conquer and overthrow the bourgeoisie, for the proletariat is the only class which is disciplined and united by Capitalism. Because only sentimental petty bourgeois and philistines can dream of overthrowing the power of the capitalists without prolonged and difficult suppression of the resistance of the exploiters, thus deluding themselves and the workers. In Germany and Austria this open resistance has not yet become manifest, since the expropriation of the expropriators has not yet begun. But there will be fierce and desperate resistance when this expropriation begins. Concealing this from themselves and the workers, the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners, are betraying the proletariat. At the most critical stage they renounce the standpoint of the class struggle aiming at the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for the standpoint of co-operation of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie, of "social peace," of reconciliation between the exploiters and exploited.

Revolutions, said Marx, are the locomotives of history. Revolutions enlighten people in a short time. The city workers and farm laborers of Germany and Austria will quickly learn that the Scheidemanns, Kautskys, Austerlitzes and Renners have betrayed Socialism. The proletariat will push aside these "social" traitors, these Socialists in words and traitors to Socialism in deeds, just as the proletariat of Russia pushed aside the petty bourgeois and philistines, the Mensheviks and "Social Revolutionists." The proletariat will learn—and the more complete the supremacy of these "leaders," the more quickly—that only by replacing the bourgeois state, though it be of the most democratic bourgeois republic, by a state of the type of the Paris Commune about which so much was said by Marx, which is distorted and betrayed by the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, by a state of the type of the Soviets, can they open the road towards Socialism. The dictatorship of the proletariat will deliver mankind from the yoke of capitalism and from wars.

prison. It has demanded for its members the same immunity from arrest enjoyed by members of the Constituent Assembly; but the policy of the Congress is not yet determined. While it convenes, however, the masses are declaring strike after strike, machine guns are in action, the proletarian revolution is on; and if the Congress hesitates, it will be swept ruthlessly aside by the dynamic and implacable mass action of the revolutionary proletariat.

It is reported the Ebert-Scheidemann Government of bourgeois-"Socialist" assassins is prepared to appeal to the Allies for troops to crush the new revolution. Let them! If it comes to a test between the Peace Conference and the proletarian revolution, the revolution will conquer, is already conquering. While these events are occurring, the Peace Conference continues its miserable squabbles (not even secret diplomacy can hide these squabbles), plays with events, being impotent to check the onward sweep of the Revolution. The Peace Conference is rapidly becoming a political ghost. Paris or Moscow, yes; but it is Moscow that represents power—the power of revolutionary Socialism, the power of the masses despised and oppressed by Capitalism, and organizing to destroy this Capitalism. The Allies can not prevent the collapse of the bourgeois-"Socialist" Government of counter-revolution in Germany; the Allies will soon have their own revolutionary problems to meet. And they cannot meet these problems. Life, liberty and peace—these are the human wants that only the international proletarian revolution can satisfy.

The "Centre" Again

THE Socialist movement has always had its divisions. These divisions are now starkly apparent, and possess an importance which until now was largely only potential. It is necessary to recognize and consider these divisions; in the measure that we solve the problems they present before the Revolution, will Socialism be able to act dynamically and consistently during the Revolution.

Usually, two divisions only are recognized — the right and the left. These two groups are engaged in an open and relentless struggle, in Germany and Russia the struggle having assumed the form of armed combat. The characteristics of the right, of moderate petty bourgeois Socialism, are clearly apparent; the moderate Socialism of the right is openly counter-revolutionary; it has betrayed Socialism and accepted the defense of Capitalism; it is a bourgeois expression, clearly and completely; it is opportunistic, social-patriotic, and bitterly opposed to the proletarian revolution and revolutionary Socialism.

But there is another group, much more important than, and as dangerous as, the moderate Socialism of the right, and that is the moderate Socialism of the "centre." In a pamphlet on *Problems of the Proletariat in the Revolution*, published in April, 1917, Lenin characterized the "centre" as follows:

The centre is hesitating between social-patriotism and actual internationalism. These people swear by all that is holy that they are Marxists and Internationalists, that they are for peace, for exerting pressure upon the government, for presenting all sorts of demands that show the desire of the nation for peace, they are peace propagandists and want a peace without annexations and they want a peace with the social-patriots. The centre is for union and against any sort of schism. The centre is the heaven of petty bourgeois phrases, of lip internationalism, of cowardly opportunism, of compromise with the social-patriots. The fact is that the centre is not convinced of the necessity of a revolution against the government of its own country; it does not preach that kind of revolution; it does not wage an incessant fight for the revolution, and it resorts to the lowest, super-Marxist dodges to get out of the difficulty. The members of the centre group are routine worshippers, caten up by the gauntness of legality, corrupted by the parliamentary comedy, bureaucrats accustomed to nice sinecures. Historically and economically they simply represent the transition from the old-fashioned labor movement, such as it was from 1871 to 1914, (and which rendered inestimable services to the proletarian through its slow, continued, systematic work of organization in a large, very large field,) to the new movement which was objectively necessary at the time of the first world-wide war of Imperialism, and which has inaugurated the social-revolutionary era.

The dangerous character of the centre is attested in the refusal of the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik) to invite any centre groups to its proposed International Communist Congress; it did not even invite the elements in the French Socialist Party represented by Jean Longuet, who is mildly "in favor" of the Soviet Government and whom many comrades in our party consider a "good" Bolshevik. More, the call for a congress issued by the Communist Party of Russia in January 1919, emphasizes its opposition to the centre, in these words:

As far as the social-patriots are concerned, who stood up everywhere in arms, in the most critical moments, against the revolution, a merciless fight is the only alternative. In regard to the "Centre," the tactic consist in separating from it the revolutionary elements, in criticizing publicly its leaders and in dividing systematically among them the number of their followers; these tactics are absolutely necessary when we reach a certain degree of development.

Lenin includes among the centre the Independent Socialists of Germany, Jean Longuet of France, the Independent Labor Party of England, and the elements in the American Socialist Party represented by Morris Hillquit.

This is important. Morris Hillquit has always been a typical opportunist, always in arms against the left wing in our party. Not to delve into old disputes, consider his attitude during the war: Hillquit pursued a policy of petty bourgeois pacifism, affiliating himself with and adopting the policy of the counter-revolutionary People's Council. Under pressure, and in pursuance of his opportunistic policy of "adapting" himself to circumstances, Hillquit accepted the St. Louis declaration of the party on the war (the most revolutionary provisions of which he had bitterly opposed at membership meetings of Local New York), and then proceeded to violate and pervert the party's policy on the war. The climax of his opportunist policy was Hillquit's answer to the question put to him by William Hard, whether, if he had been a member of Congress at the time he would have voted in favor of the declaration of war; Hillquit's answer was (*New York Call* of December 1, 1917, reprinted in the *New York Call* of December 5): "If I had believed that our participation would shorten the world war and force a better, more democratic and durable peace, I should have favored the measure, regardless of the cost and sacrifices of America. My opposition to our entry into the war was based upon the conviction that it would prolong the disastrous war without compensating gains to humanity." In other words, the divergence between Morris Hillquit and Woodrow Wilson was not a matter of principle and class policy, but one of judgement.—The declaration clearly places Hillquit as an opportunist and centre Socialist, pursuing a policy of bourgeois pacifism during the war.

When the Bolshevik Revolution broke loose and the Russian proletariat conquered power, Hillquit was silent; he was at that session of the National Executive Committee which ignored the Soviet proposal for an armistice on all fronts as a preliminary to general peace negotiations; his attitude on the problems of the Russian Revolution as they affect Socialist policy and practice has been one of opportunistic "watchful waiting." Only the other day, Hillquit acquiesced in sending delegates to Berne Congress of the Great Betrayal, of the traitors to Socialism. But now, the left wing is in action, and threatens the supremacy of the old representatives of the party. The upsurge of revolutionary Socialism in our party has made the question of an emergency national convention pressing, the membership insists upon it; and so Hillquit comes out in favor of the emergency convention! Adaption to circumstances. . . . But, more important, is Hillquit's statement concerning changes in policy:

As to the danger of heading the party into "ultra-impossibilism," I do not fear it. The centre of gravity in the international Socialist movement has of late been shifted considerably to the left, and our party cannot and should not remain behind. There are among us as always, some ill-balanced enthusiasts who are apt to shoot beyond the mark, but past experiences has shown that the party can be relied on to do the right thing in critical times.

This is a beautifully "balanced" statement, characteristic of the opportunists of the centre. You have a sop to the left wing, then a cajolery of the right by stigmatizing some comrades as "ill-balanced enthusiasts" (and this will be taken to mean the active comrades in the consciences, definitely organized left wing of the party).

There are some who are jubilant about Hillquit's "acceptance of the left wing policy." But this is premature—and preposterous. That was precisely his course at the St. Louis Convention, and then he sabotaged the revolutionary sentiments of the convention. Accepting the left wing means much more than a mild flirtation with it, it means resolute action and consistent policy. The left wing will not be lured to the centre, to an abandonment of revolutionary Socialism, by such devices. Let us ask comrade Hillquit two questions:

1.—Does comrade Hillquit accept the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing Section of the Socialist Party of New York City, which has been accepted by local after local of the party, and by the State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Mass.?

2.—Does comrade Hillquit accept the principles and policy in the call of the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik) for an International Communist Congress?

Let him answer!

The left wing in the American Socialist Party must and will be a left wing. It will not and must not gravitate to the centre, that insidious enemy of revolutionary Socialism. There must be consistent policy and resolute action. The opportunists of yesterday are discredited; they may try camouflage, but it won't work. Let the dead bury their dead. Revolutionary Socialism is resolute, open, consistent; it will conquer.

Bolshevikjabs

"PEACE Crisis" screams the headlines. Another Spring Drive!

As our confrere remarks: The problem at the Peace Conference used to be: "What are we going to do with Russia?" but now it appears that the question of the hour is "What is Russia going to do with us?"

"Wilson threatens to leave Paris," say the papers. And the British workers threaten to call Lloyd-George home. And Japan won't join unless she gets equality. And Orlando says he'll go home unless he gets Fiume. An Clemenceau is not so popular in France as he might be, according to press dispatches. Maybe we'll get peace after all.

"Paderewski voices grief over Danzig," says the *New York Times*—it might be more effective if he would play it.

In addition to the various occupations Trotsky followed during his four months sojourn in America it now appears that he was also in the moving picture business. He very appropriately played the villain in a play that was photographed in Chicago and according to the leading lady, who gives the information to the public via the newspapers, he did excellently well in the role.

Perhaps this accounts for his subsequent actions. Many a good man has been spoiled by the movies simply by watching them.

Anyhow whatever else his faults may be Trotsky cannot be accused of being lazy. With the exception of entering Congress he seems to have done nearly everything else while he was here.

A Call for a General Textile Strike

THE General Strike Committee of the 30,000 textile strikers in Lawrence, Mass., who have been out ten weeks and are more than ever determined to wage the fight to the end, has issued the following call to action:

Brother and Sister Workers of the Weaving and Yarn Mills:— Since February 3, 1919 at Lawrence, Mass., 30,000 men, women and children have been on strike for a 48 hour working week and 51 hours pay. Prior to that they were on a 54-hour week, and the average wage was \$13.50 a week for two-thirds of the mill help, the unskilled workers. The greedy mill barons had the audacity to call this an excessive "war time wage."

And when the agitation for an 8-hour day swept down upon the Textile industry of the New England States and reached Lawrence, the mill masters granted it and placed their hands into the meagre envelopes of their slaves and extracted therefrom six hours pay, and—the strike was on!

Fellow Workers! Throughout the industrial world, in every country, the workmen and women are aroused; they are organizing and striking for human conditions. In Great Britain, for instance, many millions of miners and textile workers are in the field for a six hour day, a five day week with 30% increase over the so-called "war time wages." Their battle cry is: Down with drudgery! Down with slavery!

These struggles of our European brothers are kept in mind by the 30,000 striking men, women and children of Lawrence. They are determined to carry on their unrelenting fight until the master class are brought to terms, until the efforts of the strikers are crowned with victory.

But we make this appeal to you, brother and sister workers, to come to our aid in order to hasten the day of victory not alone for the Lawrence workers but for all the men and women in the great weaving and spinning industry. The master class have centered their guns against the Lawrence strikers to crush them for the next ten years.

In this hour of great trial we urge you, all members of our class, to be prepared for a general walk out of all the shops and mills. Talk over the general strike in your homes, and with your friends and fellow workers everywhere. Organize a Strike Committee as soon as possible. Put on the Committee representatives of the various nationalities in your city. Communicate at once with us in Lawrence. Let us know just what you have one and plan to do. Let us know what we can do for you. Take definite action at once!

We call your attention to the following:

The great Woolen Trust has started to operate its plants outside of Lawrence night and day in order to defeat your brother workers of Lawrence; for instance, in the woolen mills in the state of Maine, at Filton, N. Y. and other places.

Are you willing to have the Lawrence strikers fight for you while the hirelings of the Police Department stain the pavements of Lawrence with the blood of your brothers?

Arouse then, ye men and women of the mills, of the looms and spinning frames. Be ready to stop work! Strike in great numbers, all and everyone of you.

Organize one big walkout and line up in battle array with the strikers of Lawrence for a shorter work day and more pay, in order to live and enjoy the good things of life.

Bridge no longer. Band together.

The master class are now receiving great orders and now is the time to act. Lend a hand to the Lawrence strikers. Send in funds for the needy and for the inevitable one big strike in the Textile Industry. Get ready for the time is ripe.

One big strike!
One big union!
One big victory!

The Swing to Revolutionary Socialism

By Louis C. Fraina

THE Socialist Party is in upheaval. It is being revolutionized by events, and by the organized pressure of the Left Wing within the party. Local after local of the party has adopted the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing; and now comes the State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Massachusetts, adopting the Manifesto and Program, repudiating the Berne Congress of the Great Betrayal, and insisting upon affiliation only with the Bolshevik-Spartacan International. Truly, a historic act!

The moderate "Socialists" in our party, sterile in thought and impotent in action, unable to sense the new spirit and understand the giant character of revolutionary Socialism, are aghast at the upsurge of revolutionary Socialism in the party. Unable to compress this movement within the stultifying limits of their own concepts and action, they cry "conspiracy," "organized separatism and division," "a movement to disrupt the party." Contemptible in their policy, they are contemptible in their arguments. They do not understand. They cannot understand. They will be swept aside, and then perhaps they may understand that Socialism is done with their petty bourgeois and potentially counter-revolutionary policy.

It is not a conspiracy, this upsurge of revolutionary Socialism in the party. It is the impulse of life itself. It is symptomatic of the revolutionary spirit and policy that conquered power in Russia, Hungary and Bavaria, that is active in every Socialist Party in the world, that is an expression of the revolutionary epoch of the final struggle against Capitalism into which Socialism and the proletariat have now definitely emerged.

The Marxist (not the pseudo-Marxists who have perverted Marxism, and of whom Marx himself said: "I sowed dragon's teeth, and I reaped fleas") in considering this upsurge of revolutionary Socialism, considers the objective facts of the situation. What are these facts?

Capitalism is on the verge of collapse. It is unable to extricate itself out of the multiplying contradictions implied in its maturity, in the final stage of its development. The war, provoked by Imperialism, used as a means of solving insoluble economic contradictions, multiplied these contradictions. The war produced a breakdown of the capitalist economic system in most European countries, and it equally produced the proletarian revolution—the conquest of power by revolutionary Socialism. The forces loosed by the proletarian revolution are incalculable; and they are part and parcel of the contradictions of Capitalism, of an economic collapse that staggers Capitalism. The real power in the world today is not Capitalism, but revolutionary Socialism. The final struggle is on in some countries, is developing in others. Bourgeoisie society is being revolutionized by the proletariat in action.

But that is not all. Socialism itself is being revolutionized by these epochal events. This is a fact of the first importance; it is a fact that the moderate Socialist either refuses to admit or camouflages; but it is the most important fact to the real Socialist, and is the cause of the upsurge of revolutionary Socialism in the international movement.

The proletariat has conquered power in Russia, Hungary and Bavaria. It is preparing to conquer power in other nations by means of revolutionary action and proletarian dictatorship. But this fulfillment of the ideal of Socialism is being accomplished against the opposition of the old dominant moderate Socialism. The old dominant moderate Socialism, under the test of revolutionary events, is proving counter-revolutionary. The old parties and the old leaders are against the proletarian revolution, are betraying Socialism and promoting the supremacy of Capitalism. The struggle of the proletariat against moderate Socialism is as implacable as its struggle against Capitalism; in fact, the real revolutionary struggle is the struggle against moderate Socialism, against the betrayers of Socialism.

The Marxist is not astonished at this. It is a situation produced by certain definite social alignments.

Marxian Socialism, the Socialism of the First International, was revolutionary. It accepted the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism, and it waged that struggle with all the means in its power. This Socialism considered its objective to be the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat, the annihilation of the bourgeois state and the introduction of a new proletarian state functioning temporarily as a dictatorship of the proletariat. This revolutionary International collapsed after the Franco-Prussian war. The Second International was an International of moderate Socialism. It was conservative and petty bourgeois in spirit. It was part and parcel of the national liberal movement, not at all revolutionary, dominated by the conservative skilled elements of the working class and the small bourgeoisie. It was hesitant and compromising, expressing the demands of the *petite bourgeoisie*

(for government ownership, reforms, etc.) and was dominated by the *petit bourgeois* ideology, which imagines that it can conciliate Capitalism, "grow into" the new society by means of "class co-operation," social reforms and parliamentary measures. When the test of war came, this "Socialism" accepted the war in the *petit bourgeois* spirit of either national defense or a sentimental pacifism; when the proletarian revolution came, it rejected the revolution in favor of the *petit bourgeois* policy of peaceful reforms and parliamentary action. This moderate Socialism, which may have mouthed revolution as an intellectual sport, when the

new revolutionary Socialism (which is the Socialism of Marx and the First International in action, adapting and developing Marxism in accord with the requirements of modern Capitalism and the revolutionary struggle)—this Socialism, giant in character, resplendent with the glory of the new world, terrible in its acts but beautiful in the full glory of the Communist society that is coming.

The policy and practice of moderate Socialism—reformism and parliamentarism—developed out of a period of peaceful struggles, of compromise and class cooperation. It was not a policy and practice that met the requirements of a revolutionary situation; it broke down and was repudiated by the proletariat in action. It is this situation that has developed the upsurge of revolutionary Socialism, the thrusting forward of the policy and practice of the Left Wing.

But, it is asked, why a Left Wing in the American Socialist Party? Our party, they say, was against the war; it favors Soviet Russia; it is not against the Spartacans—why then a Left Wing in our party?

Appearances are not always what they seem. Appearances may often disguise reality. Let us consider the reality.

The Socialist Party, in its majority official policy, has always been a party of moderate Socialism. In its reformism, in its rejection of revolutionary ideas, in its emphasis on parliamentary action to the exclusion of mass action, in its refusal to consider the problems of new unionism and adopt industrial unionism, in its general *petit bourgeois* policy the American Socialist Party has been bone of the bone and flesh of the flesh of moderate Socialism in Europe. Consider the party platform—it reeks with bourgeois reformism. Consider the official party press—nowhere does it emphasize the real struggle of the proletarian revolution in Europe, the struggle between majority Socialism and Left Wing Socialism, it shows no understanding or acceptance of revolutionary mass action and proletarian dictatorship. Still the old reformism! Still the old *petit bourgeois* policy!

The Socialist Party, they say, favors the Bolsheviks and the Spartacans. But how? I do not wish to be misunderstood: the party has carried out a fine agitation against intervention, in favor of Soviet Russia. But, also, I do not wish to be incomplete in the facts. And the other facts are these: the official representatives of the party were silent about the Bolsheviks until months after they conquered power, when the upsurge of Bolshevik sympathy in the party compelled the official representatives to speak. The National Executive Committee of the party, which was in session at the time, did not accept the Soviet proposal for an armistice on all fronts as a preliminary to general peace negotiations, and agitate for the armistice. The majority of the official representatives of the party greeted, at first, the Ebert-Scheidemann Government of the Counter Revolution as a "Socialist Republic"! Again the pressure of events and the upsurge of revolutionary Socialism in the party compelled a change of front. But still there is no real understanding, or refusal to understand, among the official representatives of the party.

The "party favors" the Bolsheviks and the Spartacans, but there is no statement and emphasis of the implications of this; precisely as "the party was against the war," but there was no emphasis of the implications of this revolutionary policy among most official representatives of the party, who either sabotaged the anti-war policy or interpreted it in the terms of *petit bourgeois* pacifism.

The National Executive Committee has issued literature against intervention and "favoring" Soviet Russia; but this same National Executive Committee selected (unconstitutionally) "delegates" to "represent" the party at the Berne Congress of the Counter-Revolution, of social-patriots and betrayers of Socialism, where Bolshevikism and proletarian revolution were repudiated.

If the party "is for" the Bolsheviks and the Spartacans, let it express this in its policy and practice, in its platform and official acts. Let it accept the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing, which is the Spartacan and Bolshevik policy and program. We do not want pious gestures; we want deeds. But, they say, the Bolshevik and Spartacan policy is a policy during a revolution, and we are not yet in a revolution. No; this policy of revolutionary Socialism is necessary at all times and can be pursued at all times; the policy is the same, the application differs. It is a policy not only during a revolution, but a policy to promote and prepare for the revolution. The Bolsheviks and the left wing groups were in action before the Revolution; the Revolution simply made them dominant. Moreover, we have emerged definitely into the revolutionary epoch of the final struggle against Capitalism: the Socialist Party must act accordingly.

Turn to the Left!

Resolutions adopted by the newly elected State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Massachusetts, at its first session, April 6, 1919.

THE LEFT WING

Whereas, the trend of world events and the experience of the Revolution in action have demonstrated the necessity for a clear-cut definition of the Socialist position; and

Whereas, the growth of opportunism and bourgeois parliamentarism within the Socialist Party has made a re-statement of the revolutionary Socialist position imperative; and

Whereas, the tendency of the officialdom within the party has been in contradiction with the revolutionary sentiments of the rank and file within the party as manifested in the St. Louis program on the war; be it therefore

Resolved, that the State Executive Committee of the State of Massachusetts herewith endorse the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing as printed in *The Revolutionary Age* of March 22, 1919; and be it further

Resolved, that we call upon the rank and file throughout the party to work and co-operate with the Left Wing movement to the end that the Socialist Party of America may become the true revolutionary expression of the American working class, and a proper party to participate in the Third International with the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik) and the Communist Labor Party of Germany (Spartacans.)

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS

Whereas, the rank and file of the Socialist Party of America has clearly demonstrated on many occasions that it is in sympathy with Bolshevik Russia and the revolutionary section of the working class everywhere, and is opposed to the tactics of right wing and centre Socialism in Germany and France, in spite of the efforts of the majority of the N. E. C. to line our party up with the reactionary Berne conference dominated by the Ebert-Scheidemann gangsters and reactionary European Socialists generally; therefore be it

Resolved, that the State Executive Committee of the State of Mass. protests against the sending of Comrade James O'Neal to Europe; and be it further

Resolved, that we call upon the rank and file everywhere through its local and branches to endorse and second the resolution of the Central Branch of Local Boston printed in *The Revolutionary Age* of March 8, 1919, stating that the party shall participate only in a conference called or participated in by the Spartacan and Bolshevik parties.

THE AMNESTY CONVENTION

Whereas, the resolution of local Queens County of the Socialist Party calling for the convening of a National Emergency Convention is being circulated for referendum; and

Whereas, the calling of the proposed National Amnesty Convention to be participated in by bourgeois groups in contrary to the best Socialist practice and was intended to head off the growing demand for a National Emergency Convention of the Party, be it therefore

Resolved, that the State Executive Committee of the State of Massachusetts condemn the proposed Amnesty Convention; and be it further

Resolved, that we support the call for a National Emergency Convention; and be it further

Resolved, that we call upon the rank and file to support our action in these matters by voting "yes" on National Referendum B, 1919 and by condemning through their branches and locals the proposed National Amnesty Convention.

revolution came discovered (to the astonishment of some naive souls) that it was interested, not in Socialism, but in bourgeois democracy!

But Socialism is not an intellectual sport. It is a necessity of the proletarian class struggle. It is a thing of deeds, not of words. While Socialism as a whole was moderate, it held within itself revolutionary elements, such as the Bolsheviks in Russia, the Spartacans in Germany, the Left Wing groups everywhere. And when the revolutionary proletariat marched on to the assault against Capitalism and Imperialism, it rallied around this minority revolutionary Socialism in an implacable struggle against the moderates. From acceptance of an imperialistic war, moderate Socialism proceeded to an acceptance of the counter-revolution. Moderate Socialism collapsed, miserably and vilely; but out of this collapse, an historic necessity, arose the

The Russian Proletariat in Action

By Eadmonn MacAlpine

TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD, by John Reed.
Boni and Liveright, New York, pp. 371. Price \$2.00 net.

IT IS a commonplace that great poets and artists must first die to gain recognition from the world. The comparative truth of this lies in the play of competition, petty jealousy, personal interests and the variety of weakness to which mankind is heir, upon the living personalities of the artists in question, and partly in the childish tendency to glorify the past and future while belittling the present. And so it is with the happenings of our times. The American Revolution, the exploits of the ragged, starved Continental Army; the French Revolution, the upsurge of the French people with their cry of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," the Paris Commune, the swing of the down-trodden masses into action—stir the blood and make the reader sigh for the days when history was being written in letters of flame. The fall of the Bastille calls to our youth and we name it a great episode. . . . But in our own day the crash of falling thrones calls forth a whimpering protest that the dust gets into our eyes.

John Reed is one of the more fortunate of our generation—fortunate in being privileged to witness the greatest act in history and more fortunate still in being gifted with eyes impervious to the dust—while we are fortunate that he can paint in vivid words the picture that he saw. Many persons have witnessed the Russian Revolution and a few of them have been word-craftsmen, but invariably they have come back to tell of the motes within their eyes.

In his book, *Ten Days that Shook the World*, Reed is frankly a partisan of the Russian workers, peasants and soldiers. He is an avowed admirer of Lenin and Trotsky, he has a good-natured, contemptuous tolerance for the inability of the Menshevik and Right Social Revolutionary leaders and an open dislike for the policies, tactics and personalities of the spokesmen of the bourgeois parties. He senses the tragedy of Kerensky, an undertone of sympathy runs through the passage dealing with his failure—sympathy with the individual, regret for the weakness of a great figure. Reed makes no secret of where his sympathies lie. He has his finger on the pulse of the Russian masses, he feels the grandeur of their struggle, he recognizes that he is witnessing the birth of a new era, he is tolerant of their mistakes and marvels that they are so few. But though Reed is at one with the masses in their striving after new life, though he senses the immensity of the task they have undertaken, he remembers that he is to play the role of historian and concerns himself with facts. And this is the power of the book—he lets events tell their own story, and he backs the story with a mass of documentary evidence.

Among all the works written around the revolution this is the book that will live after the passions of the moment have died down; it is a history of actual happenings. A history, written not in the dry-as-dust language of the conventional historian, but in the vigorous, picturesque style of an able journalist—but nevertheless history! The living history of the world's greatest epic, written by a man who knew the great portend of the events he witnessed, who saw, beneath the confusion and turmoil of bloody revolution, the great soul of the centuries-long oppressed masses groping towards the light of a new day.

Reed presents the picture in all its confusion, he piles event upon event in breathless succession. He jumps from the council hall, where a thousand delegates debate, to the barricades, where bullet and bayonet translate debate into action. He travels to the front line trenches of the external front, visits the soldiers' Soviets and hears their deliberations, sups with the officers and learns their opinions, returns to Petrograd. . . .

In vivid paragraphs he traces the currents swirling in the various congresses, conventions and committees that were in continuous session throughout the first days of the proletarian revolution:—

"I declare the first session of the Second Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies open!"

The election of the presidium took place amid stir and moving about. Avanesov announced that by agreement of the Bolsheviks, Left Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks Internationalists, it was decided to base the presidium upon proportionality. Several Mensheviks leaped to their feet protesting. A bearded soldier shouted at them, "Remember what you did to us Bolsheviks when we were the minority!" . . . the old Tsay-ee-kah stepped down, and in their places appeared Trotsky, Kamieniev, Lunatcharsky, Madam Kollantai, Nogin. . . . The hall rose thundering. . . .

"The order of the day," said Kamieniev. . . .

But suddenly a new sound made itself heard, deeper than the tumult of the crowd, persistent, disquieting—the dull shock of guns. People looked anxiously toward the clouded windows, and a sort of fever came over them. Martov, demanding the floor, croaked hoarsely. "The civil war is beginning, comrades! The first question must be a peaceful settlement. . . ."

A soldier announced that the All-Russian Peasants' Soviets had refused to send delegates to the Congress; he proposed that a committee be sent with a formal invitation. "Some delegates are present," he said, "I move that they be given votes."

Kharash, wearing the epaulettes of a captain, passionately demanded the floor. "The political hypocrites who control this Congress," he shouted, "told us we were to settle the question of Power—and it is being settled behind our backs, before the Congress opens! Blows are being struck against the Winter Palace, and it is by such blows that the nails are being driven into the coffin of the political party which has risked such an adventure!" Up roared him Gharra: "While we are here discussing propositions of peace, there is a battle on in the streets. . . . The Socialist Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks refuse to be involved in what is happening, and call upon all public forces to resist the attempt to capture the power. . . ." Kutchin, delegate of the 12th Army and representative of the Trudoviki: "I was sent here only for information, and I am returning at once to the Front, where all the Army Committees consider that the taking of power by the Soviets, only three weeks before the Constituent Assembly, is a stab in the back of the Army and a crime against the people—" Shouts of "Lie! You Lie!" When he could be heard again, "Let's make an end of this adventure in Petrograd! I call upon all delegates to leave this hall in order to save the country and the Revolution!" As he went down the aisle in the midst of a deafening noise, people surged in upon him, threatening. Then Kintchuk, an officer with a long brown goatee, speaking suavely and persuasively: "I speak for the delegates from the Front. The Army is imperfectly represented in this Congress, and furthermore, the Army does not consider the Congress of Soviets necessary at this time, only three weeks before the opening of the Constituent—" shouts and stamping, always growing more violent. Soldiers began to stand up all over the hall.

"Who are you speaking for? What do you represent?" they cried.

"The Central Executive Committee of the Soviet of the Fifth Army, the Second F— Regiment, the First N— Regiment, the Third S— Regiment. . . ."

"When were you elected? You represent the officers, not the soldiers. What do the soldiers say about it?" Jeers and hoots.

"We, the Front group, disclaim all responsibility for what has happened and is happening. . . ."

. . . . At intervals in the almost continuous disturbance Hendelman, for the Socialist Revolutionaries, could be heard protesting against the bombardment of the Winter Palace. . . . "We are opposed to this kind of anarchy. . . ."

Scarcely had he stepped down than a young, lean-faced soldier, with flashing eyes, leaped to the platform, and dramatically lifted his hand:

"Comrades!" he cried and there was a hush. "My familia (name) is Peterson—I speak for the Second Letish Rifles. You have heard the statements of two representatives of the Army Committees; these statements would have some value if their authors had been representatives of the Army—" Wild applause, "But they do not represent the Army—" Shaking his fist. "The Twelfth Army has been insisting for a long time upon the re-election of the Great Soviet and the Army Committees, but just as your own Tsay-ee-kah, our Committee refused to call a meeting of the representatives of the masses until the end of September, so that the reactionaries could elect their own false delegates to this Congress. I tell you now, the Letish soldiers have many times said, 'No more resolutions! No more talk! We want deeds. The Power must be in our hands! Let these impostor delegates leave the Congress! The Army is not with them!'"

The hall rocked with cheering. . . .

And then he shows the currents merging into the central stream and sweeping onwards leaving futile eddies in its wake—

. . . . In the first moments of the session, stunned by the rapidity of events, startled by the sound of cannon, the delegates had hesitated. For an hour hammer-blow after hammer-blow had fallen from that tribune, welding them together but leaving them down. Did they stand then alone? Was Russia rising against them? Was it true that the Army was marching on Petrograd? This they clear-eyed young soldier had spoken, and in a flash they knew it for the truth. . . . This was the voice of the soldiers—the stirring millions of uniformed workers and peasants were men like them, and their thoughts and feelings were the same. . . .

The whole undertone of the book shows Reed's intense sympathy with the revolution. Occasionally it breaks out in lightning flashes. "Now there was all great Russia to win and then the world! Would Russia follow and rise? And the world—what of it? Would the peoples answer and rise, a red world tide?" "Did Russia was no more; human society flowed molten in primal heat, and from the tossing sea of flame was emerging the class struggle, stark and pitiless—and the fragile, slowly-cooling crust of new plan-

ets—" "—I suddenly realized that the devout Russian people no longer needed priests to pray them into heaven. On earth they were building a kingdom more bright than any heaven had to offer, and for which it was a glory to die." "In the bitter dusk they tramped, men and women, their tall bayonets swaying; through streets faintly lighted and slippery with mud, between silent crowds of bourgeois, contemptuous but fearful. . . ." But he does not garnish his tale, always he returns to facts, facts from all sides. He apparently feels that they are the greatest propagandists, and only now and then does the artist break away from the artist-historian, and become the passionate painter of the "ascending soul of the people."

The whole tenor of the book shows that Reed understood the significance of the revolution, that he was able to see the great idealism of the masses beneath the horror of the bloody struggle, that he glimpsed the beauty of the new world in the midst of the ruins of the old, even as the workers, who raked the beauty of the Kremlin with their cannons, saw in the falling masonry the rise of the living beauty of human freedom and so overcame the traditions of centuries. And it is this understanding, this deep insight, that stamps truth in every line of the work. The writer tells all that he saw, he endeavors to hide nothing.

He paints the crudity of the peasant, the roughness of the worker, the hardness of the soldier. He uses the language of the people, he portrays their inability to understand the fine points of theory and at the same time their firm grasp of fundamentals—the reiteration of the soldier when pitted against the university student: "There are two classes, don't you see, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, only two classes, and whoever isn't on one side is on the other." He feels no necessity to smooth over the rough places: the suspicion, the violent passions, the uncounted—all are in the book. "And whose fault is it? your damn Kerensky, dirty bourgeois! To hell with Kerensky! We don't want him! We want Lenin." Or again: "A number of soldiers slouching at the entrance asked eager questions. A spy? A provocator? We mounted a winding stair and emerged into a great, bare room with a huge stove in the centre, and rows of cots on the floor, where about a thousand soldiers were playing cards, talking, singing and asleep. . . . I stood in the doorway, and a sudden silence ran among the groups, who turned and stared at me. Of a sudden they began to move, slowly and then with a rush, thundering, with faces full of hate. 'Comrades! Comrades!' yelled one of my guards. 'Committee! Committee!' The throng banked round me, muttering: Out of them shouldered a lean youth, wearing a red arm-band. 'Who is this?' he asked roughly. . . ."

It is evident that Reed is a journalist, he has the journalistic greed for knowledge. Everyone he meets has opinions about what is happening and he is interested in those opinions. He devotes as much space to what the cab driver thought of a particular incident as to what one of the participants felt. He jumps the reader from an all night debate, where the fate of the revolution hung in the balance, to the reactions of his bourgeois landlady, who was firmly convinced that the Bolsheviks were devils. He listens to snatches of street corner arguments, he reports stump speakers, he talks with palace footmen, who have not realized that their occupation is gone, he goes with Krylenko to swing the wavering regiments to the revolution, and he talks with the girl telephone operators.

He gets the thousand angles of the struggle and sets them down, giving the confusion of the great upheaval,—the straws blowing in the wind,—but always he keeps the order that lay underneath before the reader. He watches the straws as they whirl in the little cyclones, sometimes he follows them round till they drop to earth or are blown over the house-tops, but ever he follows the forward sweep of the wind. . . .

The book is what it purports to be—a history of a slice of the revolution. The writer knew that the events he was witnessing were transforming the world; but he concerns himself not at all with how the world liked the operation. He knew that the outside world was literally being shaken but he feels no necessity for easing the shock—nearly all the other writers have taken the world's feelings into consideration. Reed tells what happened.

This work is bound to meet with adverse comment, chiefly because people do not like the truth, but even the most hostile critic will praise the vividness and swing of the book, and the mass of documentary evidence that is appended will silence all but the most audacious. Mr. Sisson might refute the documents.

The publishers announce the early publication of another volume from Reed's pen, *Kornilov to Brest-Litovsk*, we await its appearance with impatience.

A "Socialist" Prosecuting Attorney

By Nicholas I. Hourwich

AT the joint session of the central committees of all New York locals of the Socialist Party, held Monday, March 17, representatives of the Labor Defense Union for the defense of political prisoners, stated officially, for the first time, it seems ("unofficially" it had become known a great deal earlier), the "case" as the party moralists very likely would call it, and carefully term it, concerning the Milwaukee "Socialist" prosecuting attorney. This guardian of law and order, elected on the Socialist Party ticket about a year ago, arrested in Milwaukee and sentenced for "seditious activity" fifteen persons—Socialists and Anarchists. During the confinement of these comrades an explosion took place in the prison, which resulted in the death of eleven policemen. The explosion was, of course, laid to the imprisoned "seditious persons," and though there were neither data nor proofs of their guilt, the "Socialist" prosecuting attorney, with zeal and ardor that would give credit to any of the capitalist "guardians of order," decided to investigate the "case" and to secure a verdict "guilty." "The case" was conducted according to all rules of the prosecuting attorney's art. All means were resorted to—means which have given so much "honor" to the San Francisco prosecutor, Fickert, who accomplished the sentencing of Thomas Mooney. The laurels of Mr. Fickert, apparently, secured the envy of his "Socialist" colleague in Milwaukee!...

In search of "evidence," the residences of all suspected persons were raided, by order of "our" Milwaukee prosecutor; correspondence was seized; also Socialist literature, and portraits of Marx, Engels, and other Socialist workers and writers.

The hearing was scheduled for the very day when the funeral of the eleven policemen was to be held, at the time when the disposition of the man in the street was especially excited against all sorts of "seditious persons" and all sorts of "sedition." At the trial, the "Socialist" prosecutor delivered a pathetic speech, during which he flourished before the eyes of the jury the portraits of Marx, Engels and Bakunin, and So-

cialist brochures found at the residences of the men under trial, asserting that all this "circumstantial evidence" established beyond dispute the "criminal state of mind" of the men on the stand, and their participation in the explosion....

As might be expected, the prosecutor won a "brilliant victory," and "justice" triumphed. All the men on trial were found guilty, and were sentenced to imprisonment, the terms reaching 25 years!...

And since virtue is always rewarded in this best of all possible worlds, the virtue of the prosecutor and the abilities of this "Socialist" representative of the "good Socialist city" of Milwaukee were also rewarded. At the last November elections in Milwaukee, the hero-prosecutor, who had upheld the honor of the Socialist Party, and who had proved to the dismay of its enemies that a "Socialist" prosecutor is never lagging behind a bourgeois prosecutor, was, as recognition of his "services" to the party, again re-nominated by the party, and again elected as prosecuting attorney.

Such is the brief but instructive story of how a "Socialist" prosecutor of Milwaukee "fought for" the emancipation of the working class!...

We do not doubt that this story will evoke a feeling of repulsion and indignation in all members of the Socialist Party. We do not doubt that ever the right wing of the party (with the exception, perhaps, of Milwaukee, for whom, apparently, Socialism does not exist) will turn its back on an individual who so openly and unceremoniously transgresses Socialist "ethics," and as Pontius Pilate washing his hands, will bring him to the party court. We do not entertain very much assurance—there are too many things that makes us pessimistic in this respect—but we are ready to hope that the party court will expel this "Socialist Prosecutor" from the party.

The moderates of the right wing of the party will then come to us with a sigh of relief and with the

noble consciousness of a duty performed, and they will say: "You see, we have expelled him. The party is purified and its honor vindicated."

But we shall answer these party moralists: "Is it really so? Can it be, really, that the expulsion of this or that individual party member who has violated Socialist principles will 'save' and 'purify' the party? And is it appropriate that you should express your indignation at this ill-fated 'violation'? Look at London, Berger & Co., whom you have been in the habit of ardently defending and praising at all times. Indeed, all these leaders of yours are, in greater or smaller degree, daily doing the same thing which has provoked your indignation in the Milwaukee 'comrade-prosecutor'; they are traitors to Socialism and to the cause of proletarian emancipation."

No! By merely expelling this or that member of the party you will not cleanse the party and save its honor. Paraphrasing the materialistic formula of Marx, it is not the individual party members who determine the party consciousness, but, on the contrary, the consciousness of the individual member is determined by the party life. In other words, the "collapse of Socialist morals" in the party, treason to Socialist principles by individual members of the party, are the result and the symptoms of the general disease in the whole party organism. The party as a whole has not yet learned the revolutionary lessons of proletarian experience in Russia and Germany. In spite of these lessons, the party as a whole continues to follow the old worn-out policy of opportunism, compromise and cheap "reformism." But that which did not comparatively affect the party in the past during the period of peaceful development, must necessarily result in acute diseases in this period of revolutionary transition.

To really cure the party of its diseases, the party must abandon the environment of opportunism for a healthy "revolutionary climate." This is the problem of the recently formed Left Wing of the American Socialist Party. The cure for the diseases of the party is prescribed by the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing. There is no other cure.

On Bolshevism, Russian and American

By John Reed

(Letter to the New York Times, refused publication)

I USUALLY take no notice of what appears in the kept press, but the attitude of all the capitalist papers—of which your journal is undisputedly the most powerful—toward the investigation of Bolshevism now proceeding in Washington, is so outrageous, and involves me personally so directly, that I feel called upon to protest.

I am certain that you will not publish this letter in full. I send it, however, so that you may suppress it, after which I can publish it in another paper.

After falsifying my testimony before the Senate Committee so as to make it appear that I approved of the "ideals" but not the "practices" of Bolshevism, you make an editorial statement to that effect. As a matter of fact I do not disapprove of Bolshevism for the United States—I heartily approve it. What I said before the Senate Committee was that I did want the industrial Commonwealth established here, but that in all countries necessarily its forms would be somewhat different—just as in all Republics at present the forms are different, while the principle remains the same. As for the principles of Bolshevism, I hope they will be applied in every country on the face of the globe—workers' control of industry, socialization of land, and the temporary dictatorship of the proletariat necessary to accomplish these things.

My one complaint against you and the other paid agents of the capitalist class is, not that you oppose Bolshevism, but deliberately pervert and suppress the truth about it, and about what is going on in Russia. It is all very well to state that Bolshevism means wholesale murder, socialization of women, robbery unrestrained, and then say that I stand for it. It is all very well to say that the Bolsheviks are anarchists (although anarchy in Russia and in America is openly opposed to the strongly centralized proletarian state built up in Russia), and then call us, who defend Bolshevism, anarchists. This of course is a very convenient method of carrying on a sinister propaganda for the benefit of those ruthless interests who plunged the world into a war which cost more than seven million lives, and who are rich with blood-money. But it is not the truth—and you know it is not the truth.

You know, for instance, that the Reverend George Simons made false statements in Washington. You know that publisher Francis made false statements before the Committee. You know that the Committee investigating Bolshevism deliberately set out to hear nobody but witnesses against the Soviet Government,

and accepted as gospel truth the cheapest sort of ignorant denunciation poured out by all the opponents of the only government of, by and for the people now on earth. We, who supported the Soviet Government, side of the case, were allowed to do so because we insisted, and made a row—and then our testimony was falsified, and cut, and deliberately misinterpreted by the newspapers—even as much of it as was allowed by the third degree methods by which the Committee's investigation was conducted.

My wife, Louise Bryant, was carefully questioned as to her belief in God; in order, so the Committee said, to ascertain her regard for the sanctity of an oath. According to the testimony of the witnesses opposed to Bolshevism, it seems to me that it might have been a good thing to question them, rather than us.

You have said on your editorial page that I am "a paid agent of the Bolsheviks." That is a straight lie, and I have no doubt that you know it. In a country where German propaganda has been heavily financed, and no one punished for receiving money for spreading it—in a country where British and French propaganda has been openly spread and openly paid for, not only since we entered the war but before it, unrestrained, and where every little national group has its paid publicity agents—even those groups of Finns and Ukrainians who represented and represent now governments set up by the Imperial German Government,—in a country whose own expenses for official propaganda in Russia against the Soviet Government run into hundreds of thousands of dollars, the accusation sounds a little hypocritical.

The business of spreading what you call "Bolshevik propaganda" is not very lucrative, as you yourself must know. There is no money in speaking to working class audiences, or writing in working class papers, which are the only audiences and papers open to any advocacy of the truth about Soviet Russia. The Soviet Government, to my knowledge, has never sent a cent here for propaganda of any sort—except to Santeri Nuorteva, official representative of the People's Government of Finland, who demanded a hearing before the Overman Committee in Washington, and whom the Committee was afraid to call. Even my rather heavy witicism about the "wealthy ladies" of New

York"—misquoted into the bargain—which was presented in such a solemn matter by your paper, does not indicate any source of support for the Soviet Government's propaganda, for I do not know a single lady, wealthy or otherwise, who ever contributed a single cent for the worthy purpose of opening a Soviet Information Bureau.

All persons who work for an unselfish purpose for little or nothing are incomprehensible to persons who never work for nothing, and who can be hired to work for anything. The capitalist organs of publicity impute to us their own tactics. It is known to everyone that any kind of publicity work requires funds, for an office, for stenographers, stationery, a typewriter, stamps and so forth. But all that necessary expense is transmuted by you into skeries which permit us to take vacations at Palm Beach. I may say here that if the American Government would allow funds to come to us from Russia, we would gladly use them to open an Information Bureau about Russia. You are correct when you call this "Bolshevik propaganda," for the great majority of persons who learn the truth about Russia become convinced Bolsheviks. Nothing else is needed.

But the American Government does not allow funds to come from Russia, and therefore it is wrong to call us "paid agents." You are perfectly well aware that all the vast machinery of the Department of Justice, the Department of State and the secret detective services of public and private organizations have been and are at work to find some trace of money coming from Russia to Socialists and others here; and you know that they have not found it, nor will they ever find it.

Another statement on your editorial page deserves notice. After falsifying or omitting parts of Raymond Robbins' testimony, to make it appear that he supports the cheap defamers of Soviet Russia, you triumphantly mark that the "parlor Socialists counted on Robbins to uphold their contentions, and that he failed them."

This is not true. No one of us ever thought that Raymond Robbins would support Bolshevism or Socialism, of which he has been a constant opponent for years. We said that he would "try" to find out what went on in Soviet Russia, and if you dared to publish his full testimony, and our direct criticism by editorial comment, you would find that we have been completely justified.

Imperialism — the Final Stage of Capitalism

(Continuation)

III

Finance capital and the financial oligarchy

A CONSTANTLY larger proportion of the capital invested in industry," writes Hilferding, "does not belong to the men who use it in their business enterprises. That capital is placed at their disposal by banks which represent the actual owners of those funds."

"On the other hand, a bank must invest a constantly larger portion of its available capital in some industry. Consequently the bank becomes, to a constantly larger extent, an industrial capitalist. This banking capital, in the shape of currency, which can be thus transformed into industrial capital, I shall designate as finance capital—capital placed at the disposal of bankers and used by industrial operators." (43)

This definition is not complete for it leaves out one of the most important factors: the growth of concentration in industry and capital to the point where it creates monopoly.

But Hilferding continually emphasizes, especially in the two chapters preceding the one from which the definition is taken, the role played by capitalist monopolies. Concentration of industry; monopolies that result from it; alliance between banks and industry; such is the history of finance capital and such is the meaning of the expression.

We shall now show how the manipulations of the capitalist monopolies unavoidably bring about under our present system of production of goods and of private property, the dictatorship of a financial oligarchy. We may notice that the representatives of bourgeois political economy in Germany and other countries, Rösser, Schultze-Gaevernitz, Liefmann and others, are without exception, defenders of Imperialism and finance capital. They do not throw light, but darkness, upon the process through which a financial oligarchy comes into being; they depict its methods in rosy colors, they remain very vague as to its sources of profits, lawful and otherwise, its connection with parliaments and so on. They dodge unpleasant questions and take refuge in high-sounding, obscure phraseology, they speak of a "feeling of responsibility" among bank directors, of the Prussian officials' "sense of duty," discuss seriously perfectly futile bills providing for "control" and "regulation," they waste their time in making up "scientific" definitions like the following, perpetrated by Professor Liefmann: "Commerce is a professional activity, which collects goods, keeps them and disposes of them." (44)

Commerce existed then among primitive men who were even ignorant of barter and will exist also in a Socialist form of society.

But there is such an abundance of facts about the wonderful dictatorship of the financial oligarchy, that in all the capitalist countries, in America, in France, in Germany, we find a rich literature dealing with the subject from a bourgeois point of view, giving us an almost accurate picture of that oligarchy at work, and containing a criticism of it from a bourgeois point of view, of course.

We must mention in the first place the system of "participation" to which we alluded previously. This is what the German economist Heymann writes upon the subject:

"The head of the basic concern (the mother-concern) controls that concern; this concern controls in turn the various societies which depend upon it (the daughter-concerns). The later control other concerns which might be called the commercial grandchildren of the first. As the ownership of 50% of the stock gives anyone the control of a stock company, the head of the mother concern only needs to own one million in order to control eight millions invested in the 'grand-children companies.' And if that process is extended even further, a capital of one million may control 16 or 32 millions." (45)

We know from experience that the ownership of about 10% of the stock assures practical control of the affairs of a company, as a large number of the small and scattered stockholders never have a chance of taking part in stockholders' meetings. The "democratic" distribution of stock, which bourgeois sophists and opportunists and certain "social democrats" expect to democratize capital, and to increase the importance and the power of the small manufacturers, is in reality one of the devices which strengthen the hands of the financial oligarchy. This is why, in progressive capitalist nations and in the more old-fashioned ones, legislation allows the issuing of constantly smaller shares of stock. In Germany the smallest face value of a share of stock is 1,000 marks, and the financial magnates, of that country look with envy upon England where the law allows shares worth only one pound sterling.

Stenhaus, one of Germany's industrial and financial magnates, declared in the Reichstag on June 7,

1900, that the pound stock share was the foundation of British Imperialism. (47)

That merchant had a more thorough and Marxist understanding of the meaning of Imperialism, than a certain writer who is supposed to be the founder of Russian Marxism and who imagines that Imperialism is the unpleasant characteristic of only one European nation.

The system of "participation" not only helps monopolies to build up their giant power, but enables them to put through with impunity dark and unholy deals and to rob the public, for the heads of the "mother-concerns" are not legally responsible for the acts of the "daughter-concerns" which are supposed to be independent and through which a good many things can be done.

Here is an illustration taken from the German magazine, *Bank*, for May 1914: "The Spring Steel Stock Company of Kassel was considered a few years ago as one of the most prosperous concerns in Germany. Bad management caused dividends to dwindle from 15% to nothing. It appears that the management had extended to one of its 'daughter-concerns,' the Chassia, whose nominal capital amounted only to a few hundred thousand marks, a loan of six million marks, and this without consulting the stockholders. Of this loan which amounted to almost three times the stock capital of the 'mother-concern,' the Chassia's books made no mention."

From the purely legal point of view that omission was perfectly permissible, and could be allowed to subsist for two years, for it did not run counter to any commercial statute. The chairman of the managing board who, as the responsible person in charge, signed the lying balance, was and still is, the president of the Kassel Chamber of Commerce. The stockholders learnt of that loan to the Chassia Company only later when it proved to have been a "mistake" (I can't help placing the word between quotation marks) and when the stock of the Spring Steel Company, being dumped by the well-informed, suffered a break of about 100%....

This striking example of the book juggling which is a matter of frequent occurrence in the management of stock companies shows us why their directors engage more easily in risky deals than a private businessman would. Up-to-date bookkeeping methods not only enable them to keep all knowledge of their risky deals from the average stockholder, but also to dodge all responsibility and escape losses in case of mishap, for they can unload their stock at the opportune moment, while a private businessman would have to meet the deficit out of his own pocket.

The books of many stock companies are very similar to those parchments of the Middle Ages which were used twice by scribes and whose real content is not known until one erases the second layer of ink.

The simplest and most common method of keeping books in order to foil all attempts at investigation, is to divide up one enterprise into several "daughter-concerns" or to combine the latter anew. This method seems so advantageous from every point of view, legal and illegal, that there are very few concerns which have not resorted to it. (48)

Among the large and monopolistic concerns using this method on a large scale, we may mention the Allgemeine Elektrische Gesellschaft, of which we shall speak in detail later. In 1912 it was estimated that this company "participated" in the affairs of 175 or 200 other companies, controlling them and, through them, a capital of about 1,500,000,000 marks. (49)

The various methods of inspecting books or accounts, the various reports published and other devices offered to the public by benevolent professors or functionaries, whose benevolence expends itself in defending Capitalism and apologizing for it, are the merest nonsense. For private property is sacred and no one can be prevented from buying, selling or exchanging shares of stock, hoarding them, etc....

The extent to which the "participation" system has been adopted by the leading Russian banks is shown by E. Agad, who was for fifteen years in the service of the Russo-Chinese Bank and who in May 1914, published a book bearing the rather inaccurate title *The great banks and the world market*. (50) The author divides the leading Russian banks into two principal groups: those which are being operated under the system of "participation" and those who are independent. By independent, he means independent from foreign banks. The first group he divides up into three sub-groups according to whether German, English or French banks "participate" in their operative banking capital invested in commerce and industry) and speculative banking capital (used for stock and financial deals). With his bourgeois reformist

mind, he imagines that it is possible under a capitalist system to distinguish the former and the latter. Here are the data furnished by Agad:

Active capital of banks to the reports for October and November 1913:

Groups of Russian Banks	Capital invested: in millions of rubles		
	For Production	For Speculation	Total
a) 1-4 banks, the Siberian commercial, the Russian, the International and the Discount Bank	413.7	889.1	1,272.8
a) 2-2 banks: the Commercial and Industrial Bank and the Russian English Bank	29.8	109.1	408.4
a) 3-5 banks: the Russian-Asiatic, the Petrograd Bank, the Don-Asiatic Bank, the Union Bank, the Moscow Bank, the Russian French Commercial Bank	711.8	641.2	1,353.0
Totals 11 Banks	1,264.8	1,680.4	3,045.2
b) 8 banks: the Moscow-Merchants Bank, the Volga-Kamsk Bank, Ymker and Co., Petrograd Commercial, formerly Vavilberg, the Moscow Bank, formerly the Rabushinsky Bank, the Moscow Discount Bank, the Moscow Commercial and the Moscow Private Bank	504.4	301.1	805.2
Totals 19 Banks	1,869.2	2,080.5	3,949.7

According to the above figures, out of nearly four billions of rubles, which constitute the working capital of the leading banks, some 3 billions or over 75% of that capital, is controlled by banks which are in reality the "daughter-concerns" of foreign banks, in the first line French banks, the famous banking trio: The Union Parisienne, Banque de Paris et d'Inde, and La Societe Generale, and in the second line Berlin banks: the Deutsche Bank and the Disconto Gesellschaft. In 1912, two large banks, the Russian Bank for Foreign Commerce, and the Petrograd International Commercial Bank, increased their capital from 44 to 68 million rubles, and their reserves from 15 to 30 millions, three fourths of their capital being German capital. The former belongs to the group of the Deutsche Bank of Berlin, the other to the group of the Berlin Disconto Gesellschaft.

Our friend Agad is very indignant over the fact that the Berlin banks hold the majority of the stock and that consequently the Russian stockholders are powerless. It goes without saying that the country which exports capital gets the lion's share of the profits. For instance the Deutsche Bank of Berlin, importing into Berlin stocks of the Siberian Commercial Bank, kept them in its safe for an entire year and then sold them at 10%, having bought them at par, thus making a profit of 6 million rubles, or about a hundred per cent on the investment. Hilferding calls that "rotation profits."

Agad estimates the "resources" of the leading Petrograd banks at almost eight and a quarter billion rubles, to be accurate 8,235,000,000 rubles, and he divides up the "participation" or rather control of the foreign banks as follows: French banks 55%, English 10%, German 35%. Out of that active capital of 8,235,000,000 rubles, 3,687,000,000 rubles (or over 40% of it), belongs to syndicates of the naphtha, metal and cement industries. It appears that the alliance of banking and industrial capital has gone a long way in Russia toward establishing capitalist monopolies.

Financial capital concentrated into a few hands and enjoying a practical monopoly, derives a constantly larger share of profits from flotations, from the issuance of stock, from government loans, etc., which strengthen the power of the financial oligarchy, making the entire nation pay tribute to monopoly holders. Here is one of the numberless examples of manipulation on the part of the American trusts cited by Hilferding: In 1887, Havemeyer founded the sugar trust by combining 15 small companies whose total capital amounted to \$6,500,000. The trust's capital was, according to the American expression, "watered," and increased to \$50,000,000. This over-capitalization took into account the future profits of the monopoly just as the steel trust, also of the United States, takes into account the future profits it will derive from its monopoly, for it is constantly buying up new deposits of iron ore. And in fact, the sugar trust established monopoly prices and reaped such profits that it could pay 10% in dividends on a capital six tenths of which was watered (or 70% on the actual capital paid in when the trust was organized.)

In 1909, the capitalization of the trust was \$90,000,000. In 22 years the capital had increased over tenfold.

(To be continued)

Where Women Wait

By P. Phillips

THE following is an extract from a cable of Ben Hecht's, Berlin correspondent of *The Globe and Commercial Advertiser*:

BERLIN, March 11:—A noisy, good-natured crowd waited outside the sun-flecked walls of Moabit prison this afternoon:—men, women and children—they had been waiting since morning.

Moabit—dreary symbol of a corrupt state and system—Moabit, whose blood-flecked walls have now become an eternal monument of shame, erected by the brutal hands of those traitors to the cause of international brotherhood.

Of all corners of Berlin the most fitting for slaughter. Scene of a million tragedies and unmentioned persecutions, it is not at all strange to us who know it, to have it selected by a band of cowards as the stage for the greatest horror of them all.

From the above cable, one might be led to believe that the clock had been turned back five years—to that glorious spring of 1914, say, when the world still laughed. "Women and children waiting since morning—good-naturedly"—what else could it have meant—but a happy crowd on a holiday? On its way to the dear, old Circus Schumann—perhaps? Or out for its spring "lauf-partie" (walking trip) into the beautiful Grunewald forests, dear to the hearts of all Berliners—Grunewald with its tall pine trees, its dark blue lake, and fathomless blue sky. Its myriad beer-gardens tucked away here and there in democratic disdain of all citizens who would not walk to its cool glades. Here one got beer for ten pfennigs—and a song for a smile.

Nonsense. We are in the year of terror, 1919—thought, pregnant with poison. Year crimson with the blood of millions of martyrs. And this particular cable from Berlin is the report of the slaughter of 220 Spartacists in Moabit prison by the majority "Socialists" of that unhappy city, whose satanical leader is Herr Ebert.

Two hundred and twenty German men—Socialists, manacled together like so many helpless oxen in a stock-yard, and forced to march in front of machine guns—manned by the hands of those who a few short months before were clasping theirs in comradeship on the field of battle. Blown into eternity by these their own countrymen and "Kamerades"!

The Paris Commune pales before this shrieking barbecue of blood. The cruellest South African savage is not half so diabolical as "civilization" in its hour of re-action.

Significant, that in that crowd of "good-natured" murderers there were German Women—"waiting—for what? ... Blood.

One recoils involuntarily at the very thought of such a thing. Hideous, that women must be added to the list of insatiates.

Even I, who have lived with German women, turned cold from horror and despair when I read Hecht's account of the death of those Spartacists. I hated them for their cruelty—I branded them outcasts—and yet I had known the tenderness of them.

Then as if by magic, I seemed to feel the lips of a German Mother on my cheek—I saw the burning eyes of a German wife, lifted to mine in mute appeal—imploping me to think before I judged her, and her sisters.

A great pity, and a pity to my heart for the women of Germany—even for those who had waited in cold blood. I realized that some gigantic force had been steadily at work for five red years, undermining their bodies and brains. I thought of the story that a wonderful Southern woman had told me not long ago, of the terrible number of dope fiends that had sprung up in South since prohibition went into effect there. And of a meek and decent citizen, who, deprived of his daily beer, had taken to drinking Peruna—Vanilla extract—hair tonic—anything that would help to buck him up after the day's work. How one night after several drips of a variety of these poisons, this same law-abiding citizen had fainted, and not in the least responsible. At a bad point in the road his machine got stuck, and a kindly farmer ran out to help him in his trouble. The drunken driver took out a pistol and shot the farmer dead. His horror, when he came to several days later—in jail—for murder, was unspeakable. He had no recollection of anything that had occurred that night.

I compared the women of Germany to this demented creature and I realized that they too were the victims of hideous circumstance. The blame must go rather to the system that had turned them into blood-thirsty mockeries of their former selves. I remember them as I had seen and known them, before the war, when they had been just kindly and comfy "hausfraus". Not famous for their good-looks, but always happy, not brilliant always—but kind, honest and motherly. I saw them again as I had times without number in the past. Groups of them, standing on the corners of small towns of cities, broad, beaming and invariably busy preparing some goody or necessity for some member of society—husband, son or parent. Red-checked, smiling, contented. That was it. Contented—above everything. The curve of their broad backs suggested contentment. The smoothness of their cheeks and hair exhaled peace—patience—almost dullness in many cases!

I saw them handing out huge cheeses and wursts to hungry humanity—morn, noon and night. Cheerful, unimaginative and unselfish. I remember all this about them—and then I was filled with a burning hatred for the German government and for that hideous cancer of our times *Capitalism*.

I saw its loathsome eyes peering triumphantly down upon the Moabit scene inspired by its doctrines. And heard its ghoulish chuckle at the sight of the once meek and mild German women turned into fiends by its hellish persecutions.

Then too, I knew just what these same women had lived through for the last five years.

This "waiting" is not new to them, for they have been waiting for these many months. It is any wonder that they have become hardened?

I saw them when first they waited—way back in August of 1914. Then, they were waiting for their men to pass by, with proud boasts—and rose wreathed helmets. Smiles on their young lips—and victory in their hearts. How carelessly did the flower of Germany's manhood wave to their "waiting" women—as they passed down Unter den Linden on their way

to ... I am! It is a pity, and a pity to my heart for the women of the Redetzky March and their favorite man, the hat ein Kamerade." I will see their young faces—red-cheeked from the soft sun that touches their hair—live in the Rhine-land ... meekly. The blue of the river in their eyes—and laughter on their lips. They knew more about the trees and fair-haired creatures than they did about this business of war! And above all they knew that their women would be waiting for them when they returned.

But the years have gone by and most of them have not returned. Those women have been waiting ever since. It is maybe this same hideous waiting that has changed the women of Germany so terrible. It is easy for those of us who have waited—once in a while some time or other to realize—just what havoc it can play with the nerves—and spirit.

Their waiting has been all in vain. Something is snapped in their hearts and heads. They cannot think or act rationally any more. That went with all the peace of the past. Despair has claimed them—and now after years of agony and blood—what wonder if they have ceased to think in any terms but hate and blood? Blame those inhuman masters who foisted this war and never ending agony on to the women of Germany—and on to the workers of the whole world—and now will be doing right. Let us remember just how enormous a debt of blood we owe to those who have taken the sunlight from us. Remember that the women of Germany were once kind and contented—they bore strong children—for their Kaiser's cannons to be fed on—and possibly they feel that their whole race may as well be exterminated as not—they have little to live for—but debt—through this Peace that the autocrats are planning for the world. The women of Germany no longer can hope to be happy—nor to rear strong babes for strong young fathers. The new system—with Kaiser Ebert at the head—is as bad—if not worse—than the old. They killed—and were killed under the old regime—they are still now murdered under the new. So why not have a hand in doing so themselves? Their sons were taken from them by the former Kaiser—their hope has been taken from them by Herr Ebert—and his cohorts. On with the slaughter! Let German women have a hand in the killing—now they cry. They have grown accustomed to the sight of blood. They are hungry—they must be fed—both the women—and the cannons. Not for many a moon will the smoke curl contentedly out of small and cosy cottages—in star-filled valleys—nor the pigs play about in the gardens as they used to. There are no many men folk for the women to wait on—nor many babies to raise. There is nothing, but this huge debt to the Allies—and back-breaking labor.

May the wives and mothers of those 220 murdered men who filled Moabit prison with their "howls and splutterings" hold tight against the time when the new dawn—the red dawn—shall break.

Let them carry on the great work started by their men—and their faith in the ultimate Victory of the Workers of the World be so great that it will urge them on to new deeds worthy of their martyred men—and to the reddest revolution that the world shall know. Then we will be able to say that the 220 and Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg have not died in vain.

Unemployment and the Bolshevik Menace

THE pages of the bourgeois papers publish many articles purporting to show the possibility of Bolshevism penetrating and establishing itself in the United States. It is supposed that there is fertile ground here for Bolshevik ideas capturing the mind of the people. These articles sound a note of "warning." And the authors appeal to the prudence of the employers, pointing out that it is necessary to modify the "present conditions" lest the entire social structure should collapse.

According to bourgeois experts, the workers in the United States are exhibiting a great spirit of restlessness. The chief cause of their discontent is the increasing unemployment, which exists not in the imagination of the workers, but is a stark reality. The reports of the Federal Labor Bureau also deal with the spread of unemployment. Beginning with December 1918 the market situation has changed greatly in a direction unfavorable to the workers. Previous to that time the demand for labor exceeded the supply. But since then the supply has been growing daily and is not continued to one or two localities—it is everywhere throughout the cities and towns of the country: in Buffalo, thirteen thousand are unemployed; in Albany, four thousand; in the state of Massachusetts, fifteen thousand; in Cleveland, fifty-five

thousand; in Toledo, ten thousand; in Dayton, seven thousand; in Detroit, thirty thousand; in Minneapolis, four thousand; in San Francisco, eight thousand; in Oregon, seven thousand, etc. It is stated in the reports of the Federal Department of Labor that there is now a total of two hundred and ten thousand out of employment. Yet this figure is far below the real one. As stated by the War Community Service, in New York alone there are fifty thousand unemployed and this number is added to daily by ten thousand persons. The rapid growth of unemployment is due greatly to the demobilization of the soldiers.

In the main, the government of the United States is very inattentive to the problems arising from the demobilization of the army. The soldiers are frequently discharged without sufficient money even to return to their homes. The American government (the government of Great Britain. There the purchase of civilian labor for the right to order them in a specially selected store. Here the soldiers are being discharged in uniform. Those soldiers lacking work supply, but are often refused to be employed. Perhaps the most serious danger to the unemployed is the fact that the "respect" for the uniform will prevent them from being employed.

the soldier as a worker. The unemployment situation is fast making itself felt in the wages of the occupied workers. Many employers beholding the streets teeming with unemployed, begin to lower wages, thereby provoking dissatisfaction among the workers. The degree of the restlessness of the workers can be judged by the fact that at a recent banquet held by capitalists in honor of the Secretary of Labor, the latter did not fail to warn most seriously the employers against such tactics.

But the esteemed Secretary has evidently forgotten that where capital foresees profit there it loses as far-sightedness and all its common sense. The possibility of reaping huge profits in Europe is very problematical—Bolshevism from Russia is extending to Germany, England and France. Who can guarantee that this "red wave" will ever stop? Therefore the manufacturers turn from the unpromising situation, and in their attempt to obtain the utmost possible today, they "squeeze" as much as they can out of the American workers heedless of the consequences. But the consequences can prove a surprise to the capitalists. For, again, who can guarantee that under stress of starvation wages and unemployment the American worker and his brother in uniform—the millions he cannot discard through lack of money—may not follow the "dangerous and contagious example of some of the European countries?"